

=== COVER PAGE ===

TO: _____

FROM: WAGNERMURABITOHAD

FAX: 4089389058

TEL: 4089389060

COMMENT:

IES P. HAO
THONY C. MURABITO
HEN P. WAGNER, JR.
ENN D. BARNES
ATTHEW J. BLECHER
OMAS M. CATALE
SE S. GARCIA
ENNETH GLASS
WRENCE R. GOERKE
ICHAEL R. HARDAWAY
N C. HSU
A J. NASSERIAN

RONALD M. POMERENNE
JOHN F. RYAN
M. DEAN MATTHEWS
WILLIAM A. ZARBIS
NEAL A. OSBORN
DAVID J. REIMLER
CAROLINE W. SMITH
ARTHUR M. TONSAGER, III
JOEL D. YOUNGS

* PATENT AGENT
** PATENT ENGINEER

WAGNER
MURABITO
& HAO LLP
PATENT ATTORNEYS

TWO NORTH MARKET STREET
THIRD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95113
TELEPHONE: (408) 938-9060
FACSIMILE: (408) 938-9060
www.wmh2.com

OFFICIAL

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 05 2004

FAX COVER SHEET

SEND TO: Uyen T. Le

COMPANY NAME: USPTO

FAX NUMBER: (703) 746-5607

TRANSMISSION DATE: 1/30/04

FILE REF: SUN-P5832NP-US

FROM: Julie Williams

PAGE NUMBERS (including this sheet): 22

OPERATOR: _____

NOTES: Please see attached ~~Rep~~ Response to
Office action as previously filed with
the USPTO on 12/12/03.

Thank you,

Julie Williams

If there should be a problem with the quality of this transmission or you do not receive all of the pages, please call the operator named above at (408) 938-9060

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This FACSIMILE transmission is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above and may contain information that is confidential, attorney-client privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, reproduction, distribution or use of any of the information contained in this transmission is strictly PROHIBITED by law. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and we will arrange the return of the original

Amendment Transmittal
Applicant: **Boreham et al.** Filing Date: **05/29/01**
Docket No.: **SUN-P5832NP.US** Serial No.: **09/867,516**
Title: **METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR NESTING ROLES IN A**
DIRECTORY SYSTEM
Sir:
Please acknowledge receipt of the following:
☒ Amendment Transmittal ☒ Ext. of Time (listed on Transmittal)
☒ Amendment (No. pgs 9) ☒ Deposit Account Authorization
☐ Drawings _____ Sheets
☒ Certificate of Mailing
☒ Check # 0390 In the amount of \$ 950.00

submitted

DECLERED

Date: 1-20-04

Initials: 0

RECEIVED

DEC 22 2003

WMH



WAGNER, MURABITO AND HAO, LLP
GENERAL ACCOUNT
PH. (408) 938-9060
2 NORTH MARKET ST., 3RD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

CITIBANK
SAN JOSE, CA 95124
90-7118/3211 108

0390

PAY Nine Hundred Fifty and No/100 Dollars

TO THE
ORDER OFDATE
12/12/03AMOUNT
\$950.00

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Memo: SUN-P5832NP.US 3 MONTH EXT OF TIME

ACM

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

⑈000390⑈ ⑈321171184⑈ 601165780⑈

Amendment Transmittal

Applicant: Boreham et al.

Filing Date: 05/29/01

Docket No.: SUN-P5832NP.US

Serial No.: 09/867,516

Title: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR NESTING ROLES IN A
DIRECTORY SYSTEM

Sir:

Please acknowledge receipt of the following:

- ☒ Amendment Transmittal ☒ Ext. of Time (listed on Transmittal)
☒ Amendment (No. pgs. 9) ☒ Deposit Account Authorization
☐ Drawings _____ Sheets
☒ Certificate of Mailing
☒ Check # 0390 In the amount of \$ 950.00

Submitted
12/12/03

Attorney Docket No. SUN-P5832NP.US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

I hereby certify that this transmittal of the below described document is being deposited with the United States Postal Service in an envelope bearing First Class Postage and addressed to the Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date of deposit:			
Date of Deposit:	12/12/03	Name of Person Making the Deposit:	KATHERINE RINALDI
		Signature of the Person Making the Deposit: <i>Katherine Rinaldi</i>	

In re Application of: David Boreham, Peter Rowley and Mark C. Smith

Serial No.: 08/867,516

Examiner: Le, Uyen

Filed: 05/29/01

Art Unit: 2171

For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR NESTING ROLES IN A DIRECTORY SYSTEM

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL

1. Transmitted herewith is an amendment for this application

☒ Transmitted herewith is a response to an office action for the above identified patent application.
(9 sheets)
Transmitted herewith are _____ sheets of substitute formal drawings.
Other: _____

2. Applicant is other than a small entity

Extension of Term

3. The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.136 apply.

(a) [X] Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136
(fees: 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a)-(d) for the total number of months checked below:)

<u>Extension</u>	<u>Fee</u>
[] one month	\$110.00
[] two months	\$420.00
[X] three months	\$950.00
[] four months	\$1,480.00

Fee \$ 950.00

If an additional extension of time is required, please consider this a petition therefor.

(b) [] Applicant believes that no extension of term is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition for extension of time.

Attorney Docket No.. SUN-P5832NP.US

Fee Calculation

4. The fee for claims (37 C.F.R. 1.16(b)-(d)) has been calculated as shown below:

(for other than a small entity)					
Fee Items	Claims Remaining After Amendment	Highest Number of Claims Previously Paid For	Present Extra Claims	Fee Rate	Total
Total Claims	17	- 23 =	0	x \$18.00	\$0.00
Independent Claims	3	- 3 =	0	x \$86.00	\$0.00
Multiple Dependent Claim Fee (one or more, first added by this amendment)				\$290.00	\$0.00
Total Fees					\$0.00

PAYMENT OF FEES

5. The full fee due in connection with this communication is provided as follows:
- [x] The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No.: 23-0085.
A duplicate copy of this authorization is enclosed.
- [x] A check in the amount of \$950.00
- [] Charge any fees required or credit any overpayments associated with this filing to Deposit Account No.: 23-0085.

Please direct all correspondence concerning the above-identified application to the following address:

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060

Respectfully submitted

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

ACM

Date:

12/12/03

By:

Anthony C. Murabito
Reg. No. 35,295



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,516	05/29/2001	David Borcham	P5832	7454

7590 06/12/2003
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two N. Market st.
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

RECEIVED
JUN 16 2003
WMH

EXAMINER

LE, UYEN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 06/12/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DOCKETED **ENTD**
Date: 6-17-03
Initials: 2



Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/867,516		BOREHAM ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Uyen T Le		2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.
- 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,3.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

FORM PTO-892		U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE		SERIAL NO. 09/867516	GROUP ART UNIT 2171	ATTACHMENT TO PAPER NO.	6
NOTICE OF REFERENCES CITED				APPLICANT(S) Boreham et al			
U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS							
*		DOCUMENT NO.	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUB-CLASS	FILING DATE
	A	6,073,242	6/2000	Hardy et al.	713	201	
	B	5,815,710	9/1998	Martin et al	709	303	
	C						
	D						
	E						
	F						
	G						
	H						
	I						
	J						
	K						
FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS							
*		DOCUMENT NO.	DATE	COUNTRY	NAME	CLASS	SUB-CLASS
	L						
	M						
	N						
	O						
	P						
	Q						
OTHER REFERENCES (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)							
	R	Borgida et al "Loading data into description reasoners", ACM 1993, pages 217-226.					
	S						
	T						
	U						
EXAMINER Uyen Le			DATE June 9, 2003		Form892ccs2108b		
* A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this office action. (See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, section 707.05(a))							

Application/Control Number: 09/867,516
Art Unit: 2171

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Abstract

1. The abstract is objected to because it contains the phraseology "disclosure".

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 8-10, 12, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because:

- at claims 8, 9, 10, 12, 21, 22, 23, it is not clear what "the target entry" refers to
- at claims 10, 12, 23, it is not clear what "an entry" refers to.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 12, 19 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - claim 12 contains a typographical error at line 1. Furthermore, "the method" should be – a method—
 - claim 19, "the method as in claim 14" should be – the apparatus as in claim 14—.Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Application/Control Number: 09/867,516
Art Unit: 2171

Page 3

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12, 14, 15, 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hardy et al (US 6,073,242).

Regarding claim 1, Hardy discloses all the claimed subject matter (see the abstract, Figures 1, 4). The claimed "encapsulating distinguishing names corresponding to one or more roles to be nested" merely reads on the fact that users are associated with one or more roles in the method of Hardy. Furthermore, the roles are clearly "to be nested" since a user can have more than one role for example a user is both an employee in an enterprise and the president of the enterprise (see column 13, line 43-column 14, line 6).

Regarding claim 2, the claimed "wherein the encapsulation is expressed by adding the DNs to be nested to a predefined attribute" merely reads on the fact that the distinguished name of a user is added to a role category for example as a manager. The method of Hardy has to operate in that manner since the method is role-based (see the abstract).

Regarding claim 4, the claimed managed role type merely reads on the administrator in the method of Hardy who updates the roles (see column 10, lines 64-67).

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/867,516
Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 5, the claimed enumerated role type merely reads on the fact that a user can have multiple roles in the method of Hardy (see the abstract).

Regarding claim 6, the claimed filtered role type merely reads on the implicit authorities associated with a role for example a junior engineer is not likely to be given check signing authority (see column 12, lines 16-28).

Regarding claim 7, the claimed nested role type merely reads on the fact that the president of an enterprise is also an employee of the enterprise (see column 13, line 43- column 14, line 6).

Regarding claim 8, the claimed "wherein the encapsulating is performed if the target entry is within the scope of the role" is met by the fact that a DN is associated with roles for which it is intended for example A. Hardy with employee and president, M. Wills with employee and acting president (see column 13, line 62- column 14, line 6).

Regarding claim 9, the claimed "wherein the step of encapsulating is performed if the target entry is within the scope of the role that causes the target entry to possess the nested role" is met by the fact that a DN is associated with roles for which it is intended for example A. Hardy with employee and president, M. Wills with employee and acting president (see column 13, line 62- column 14, line 6). Clearly the role of a president causes the entry of A. Hardy to possess the nested role of an employee.

Regarding claim 10, the claimed method of validating an entry including "verifying a computed attribute to determine if the target entry possess a role contained in the nested role" is met when the method of Hardy determines A. Hardy is a president and

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 09/867,516
Art Unit: 2171

employee of an enterprise (see column 13, line 43- column 14, line 6). The computed attribute merely reads on the combination of attributes of employee and president.

Regarding claim 12, the claimed method of validating an entry including "verifying a predefined attribute to determine if the target entry possess a role contained in the nested role" is met when the method of Hardy verifies that A. Hardy is a president of the enterprise (see column 13, line 43- column 4, line 6). The predefined attribute merely reads on the attribute of president. The target entry of A. Hardy clearly possesses a role contained in the nested role since a president of an enterprise is also an employee of that enterprise.

Claims 14, 15, 17-23 correspond respectively to a system for method claims 1, 2, 4-10, thus are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 1, 2, 4-10 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3, 11, 13, 16, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardy et al (US 6,073,242).

Regarding claims 3, 11, 13, 16, 24, although Hardy does not specifically show the nsRole and nsRoleDN, the claimed attributes merely read on the fact that any attribute has to have a name. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include any name to an attribute in the method and apparatus of Hardy.

Application/Control Number: 09/867,516
Art Unit: 2171

Page 6

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Martin et al (US 5,815,710) teach managing relationships among objects in a distributed environment.

Borgida et al "Loading data into description reasoners ", ACM 1993, pages 217-226.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen T Le whose telephone number is 703-305-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Uyen Le
June 9, 2003